

OFFICIALLY ADOPTED
JULY 21, 1975

EQUAL OPPORTUNITY

PREPARED BY

CENTRAL NAUGATUCK VALLEY
REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY
20 EAST MAIN STREET
WATERBURY, CONN. 06702

JULY, 1975

701 PROJECT: CONNECTICUT CPA-CT-01-00-1034

THE PREPARATION OF THIS REPORT WAS FINANCED
IN PART THROUGH AN URBAN PLANNING GRANT FROM
THE U. S. DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN
DEVELOPMENT UNDER THE PROVISIONS OF SECTION
701 OF THE HOUSING ACT OF 1954, AS AMENDED;
BY A REGIONAL PLANNING GRANT FROM THE
DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING AND ENERGY POLICY,
STATE OF CONNECTICUT; AND BY CONTRIBUTIONS
FROM MEMBER MUNICIPALITIES OF THE CENTRAL
NAUGATUCK VALLEY REGION.

TITLE: Equal Opportunity

AUTHOR: CENTRAL NAUGATUCK VALLEY REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY

SUBJECT: A summary of pertinent State and Federal housing and employment laws and a discussion of the impact of municipal zoning, tax rates, and sewerage on housing employment and educational opportunities.

DATE: July, 1975

LOCAL PLANNING AGENCY: Central Naugatuck Valley Regional Planning Agency

SOURCE OF COPIES: All libraries of the municipalities of the Central Naugatuck Valley Region.

State Library
State of Connecticut
Hartford, Connecticut

HUD Library
Washington, D.C.

HUD PROJECT NO.: CPA-CT-01-00-1034

SERIES NO.: n.a.

NUMBER OF PAGES: 27

ABSTRACT: The report is a compilation of pertinent Federal and State employment and housing laws prohibiting discrimination in the CNVR and its municipalities. The report also includes a discussion of municipal zoning, sewerage, building requirements and public transit as they affect the opportunities of residents within the Region. The tables present information on State and Federal anti-discrimination laws, a list of Civil Rights organizations, and the number of individuals in the major classes protected by anti-discrimination laws.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
XIV. Equal Opportunity	
1. Issues	XIV- 1
2. Federal and State Regulation	XIV- 3
3. The A-95 Review process	XIV-7.2
4. Enforcement	XIV- 9
5. Tables	XIV-11
6. Policies	XIV-16
7. Bibliography	XIV-19

XIV., EQUAL OPPORTUNITY

1. Issues

In recent years the concern with equal opportunity for all individuals has surfaced in many areas previously overlooked by traditional civil rights law. Besides showing a concern for equal housing and employment opportunities, the Federal and State governments have recently been emphasizing equal opportunity in many areas falling within the purview of urban and regional planning agencies. These include health care, transportation, representation and citizen participation in government and public services such as police, fire and sanitation. A report titled The National Planning Policy of the American Institute of Planners emphasized the far reaching importance of equal opportunity in all sectors of American life. It states,

Equal Opportunity for all citizens means equal accessibility to governmental services and programs and an equal chance for all citizens to participate in American life. Many past and present institutions and programs have denied this equality of opportunity to the low income, disadvantaged and minorities, either purposely or through oversight.¹

In addition Equal Opportunity is an integral part of any discussion of such Regional issues as land use, open space and recreation, water supply and sewerage, highways, mass transit and education. As an example, zoning regulations have been used as exclusionary devices to keep minorities and low income people out of certain residential communities within the State. Similarly, many municipalities in the State have attempted to limit or prevent an influx of lower income residents by not constructing water or sewerage pipelines within their town even when land conditions allow for further development. One human rights expert has stated that in some instances, municipalities within the State have excluded the poor and minorities by appropriating land for parks and open space that could otherwise have been used for low income housing.²

¹ The National Planning Policy of the American Institute of Planners, March 1974, Washington D.C. p. 11.

² Jurate Vaitkus, Connecticut Commission on Human Rights Civil Rights and Circular A-95, unpublished and undated report.

While these forms of discrimination may not necessarily have arisen because of any interpersonal or interracial discrimination, they are a reflection of a general systemic discrimination which has principally affected minorities and the poor. To some extent these problems can be self-perpetuating since the more the poor and minorities are segregated in the urban core of the Region, the less financial and political support they receive from the more affluent suburban residents. This is particularly true with regard to the issues of education and housing.

Many of the present problems of education in the Region and the State have been connected with the overreliance of municipal government on the property tax as the means of supporting educational expenditures. Differences in the assessments of property and the tax placed on property within the Region not only has had a regressive effect on the income of the poor but has created Regional inequities in the funds available for public education. It is expected that increased reliance on State or Revenue Sharing funds to subsidize education could alleviate some of the existing disparities of education within the 13 municipalities of the Region. A fuller discussion of education within the Region is provided in the Education Element of the Plan of Development.

A second issue, that of housing, has been dealt with in detail in the Central Naugatuck Valley Regional Planning Agency's Housing Element, 1974. Briefly, the Housing Element presents a proposed fair share housing allocation plan designed to foster greater locational choices for individuals and families in the Central Naugatuck Valley Region. This Regional approach to the allocation of housing space for the poor places the burden of responsibility for housing discrimination upon all 13 municipalities, emphasizing that each municipality should take affirmative action to improve the quantity and quality of low income housing in the Region.

In addition, the Connecticut Housing Investment Fund (CHIF), a private non-profit corporation, has functioned to create open housing opportunities for minorities by assisting minority families in the purchase of homes. CHIF has been principally concerned with creating open housing opportunities in the suburbs but has also worked to maintain stable integrated neighborhoods in the large cities of Connecticut. Although CHIF cannot eliminate the problem of exclusionary zoning, it does provide financial assistance and counseling to minority families designed to allow them greater locational choice within the State.

It should be noted that many forms of discrimination are often interrelated with the result that one form of discrimination may reinforce another. As an example, many urban families who are unable to move into suburban communities because of exclusionary zoning regulations may also be deprived of better education for their children. Similarly, the lack of public transportation provided between Waterbury and the suburban municipalities may limit the employment opportunities of those urban residents without automobiles. This problem has been particularly acute in recent years as over three-quarters of all employment growth has occurred in the suburban municipalities while public transit to the suburban municipalities has declined and unemployment in Waterbury has continued to rise.

For Waterbury residents, many suburban employment opportunities may never reach their attention because (1) suburban employers may advertise job openings in suburban papers with no urban circulation (2) Waterbury residents may be unable to use bus service to look for jobs in outlying areas or (3) they lack an automobile to travel to a remote work site. For women with preschool children, employment opportunities may be further limited by the lack of day care centers within their municipality. This problem has become more common in recent years as large numbers of American families have been split up with one parent responsible for both the household duties and the financial condition of the family.

Since most of the Regional issues mentioned above often fall outside of the domain of municipal government, there has been an increasing federal and state concern that some means be developed to foster citizen participation in programs funded by state or federal agencies or in programs falling under the jurisdiction of regional planning agencies. Citizen participation is especially encouraged among those individuals and groups who have traditionally been under-represented in local government and who are often adversely affected by decisions made at the Regional or State level. The Central Naugatuck Valley Regional Planning Agency has endorsed this policy and is taking affirmative action to involve minorities and other under-represented individuals from all 13 municipalities of the Region in the total regional planning process.

2. Federal and State Regulations

While previous to the 1960's, civil rights laws were hampered by a lack of enforcement, today strong efforts are being made to make local business and government responsible for the effects of their housing and employment policies and practices. Today state and federal governments are beginning to exert strong influences over local policies by controlling the purse strings to local monies.

Fiscal controls promulgated by the state and federal governments will probably become increasingly influential in reducing discriminatory practices and in shaping policies and practices of local government in general because state and federal monies are accounting for an increasing share of all municipal expenditures. The following discussion will provide a brief review of the most important State and Federal regulations which affect regional planning policies regarding equal opportunity and affirmative action.

Federal Executive Order 11246 and the State of Connecticut Executive Orders Three and Seventeen specifically prohibit discrimination in Federal and State employment or in State or Federal contracts or subcontracts. These 3 executive orders prescribe

that government contractors will take affirmative action to ensure that applicants are employed and that during employment employees are treated without regard to their race, creed, color, sex or national origin.* In the event that discrimination is found, the U.S. Secretary of Labor and the State Commissioner of Labor may investigate alleged discrimination and hold such hearings public or private as they may deem advisable for compliance, enforcement or educational purposes. If stricter measures are required the U.S. Secretary of Labor or the Connecticut Commissioner of Labor can bring contractors to court or suspend government contracts for failing to comply with the non-discrimination provisions of the Executive Order.

A second area regulated by Federal law is public and private employment in organizations with 15 or more employees on their payroll. With the passage of the 1964 Civil Rights Act and the 1972 Equal Employment Opportunity Act (EEOA), the federal government took a more vigilant concern with providing equal employment opportunity for all people regardless of their race, sex, color, religion, or national origin. In particular the 1972 EEOA has gone beyond previous equal employment opportunity programs by attempting not only to deal with interpersonal discrimination but discrimination rooted in employment systems. A report prepared by the United States Equal Employment Opportunity Commission states,

Much discrimination, particularly against females, persists through intentional acts. But the most pervasive discrimination today results from normal often unintentional and seemingly neutral practices throughout the employment process. Employment systems perpetuate discriminatory effects of past discrimination even when original discriminatory acts have ceased and continue to discriminate, daily, creating very unequal opportunities for many minorities and women.

Identification and elimination of such "systemic" discrimination resulting from regular employment practices is the major focus of equal employment efforts today.

³ U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, Affirmative Action and Equal Opportunity, Volume I, January, 1974, Washington, D.C., pp. 4-5.

* Executive Order Number Three of the State of Connecticut also prohibits discrimination because of age.

In order to deal seriously with present discriminatory policies or the effects of past discriminatory policies which may still be lingering on in present practices, Title VII of the 1964 Civil Rights Act created a commission with the power to order all negligent organizations with 15 or more employees to undertake affirmative actions to eliminate present and future discrimination and to provide equitable remedies for the consequences of past discrimination.

As a result of the passage of the EEOA of 1972, the burden of proof now falls upon the employer if it has an under-representation of minorities and females on its payroll in relation to their presence in the regional population and the regional labor force. The EEOA Commission states,

The message conveyed by these legal rulings is clear: If a statistical survey shows that minorities and females are not participating in your work force at all levels in reasonable relation to their presence in population and the labor force, the burden of proof is on you to show that this is not the result of discrimination, however inadvertent. There is strong probability that some or part of your system is discriminating, and that unless you make changes you may be subject to legal action.⁴

In particular, the 1972 EEOA requires the removal of arbitrary and unnecessary barriers to employment where the barriers operate to invidiously discriminate on the basis of race, sex, or other impermissible classifications.⁵ In order to provide public and private employers with a guide to affirmative action within the Central Naugatuck Valley Region, Table 1 presents the number of black, Spanish speaking individuals, women and disabled or handicapped individuals in Waterbury and the Waterbury Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area. These statistics may be used by each employer within the Region to evaluate its compliance with the equal opportunity guidelines set forth by the 1972 Equal Employment Opportunity Act. Except in the very rare instances where sex, religion, color or national origin are a bona fide occupational qualification, all employers within the Region should have minorities represented on their payroll in reasonable proportion to their presence in the Waterbury SMSA civilian labor force or general population.

⁴ Ibid. p. 7.

⁵ Ibid. p. 7.

While the EEOA does not have any provisions for age discrimination the Secretary of Labor can prevent this form of discrimination under the Age Discrimination in Employment Act of 1967. This Act, as amended in 1974, stipulated that all public employers and private employers of 20 or more persons will not discriminate on the basis of age. Specifically, the Act (ADFA) is designed to provide protection to those between the ages of 40 and 65.

The Secretary of Labor also administers the Equal Pay Act of 1963. This Act prohibits discrimination in wages on the basis of sex and covers most public and private employees who are engaged in handling or producing goods for interstate or foreign commerce.*

A publication of the Wage and Hour Division of the U.S. Department of Labor states,

The Act applies only to employees engaged in substantial equal work on jobs the performance of which requires equal skill, effort, and responsibility and which are performed under similar working conditions.⁶

Those who are discriminated against in terms of wages can bring suit for back pay. Another form of employment discrimination that has been occurring with increasing frequency in recent years relates to the disparate effect of applying equal standards or administering similar examinations to different individuals. Oftentimes, standards and examinations used for the evaluation of a potential employee may discriminate against certain classes of individuals because the standards or examination may have a cultural or racial bias. This problem has frequently occurred in municipal governments that have applied time-honored civil service standards for the evaluation of black and Puerto Rican candidates applying for municipal employment. Federal purse strings can also be used to influence the policies and practices of local business and government through the non-discrimination provisions of the 1972 Revenue Sharing Act. Under Section 122a of the

* In addition a 1974 amendment extends coverage of the Act to hospitals, preschools, nursing homes, colleges, federal, state, local and interstate governments and agencies, laundries and dry cleaning enterprises, construction enterprises, and other enterprises having gross volume of sales, of over \$250,000 a year.

⁶ U.S. Department of Labor, Equal Pay under the Fair Labor Standards Act, U.S. Government Printing Office, 1974, p. 3.

Revenue Sharing Act, it is stated, While the EEOA does not have any provisions for

No person in the United States shall on the grounds of race, color, national origin or sex be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of or be subject to discrimination under any program or activity funded in whole or in part with (revenue sharing funds).⁷

Revenue sharing funds may be used for a wide variety of local services, facilities, programs or employment projects with the provision that such funds will not have a discriminatory impact on any individuals regardless of their race, color, national origin or sex. The non-discrimination provisions of the Revenue Sharing Act allows the Office of Revenue Sharing to withhold funds from local governments if such governments (1) engage in discriminatory employment practices or (2) fail to ensure that all residents share equally from the services provided by revenue sharing funded activities. Since revenue sharing funds may go to education, housing, transportation, road improvement, public services, health care, recreation as well as other areas, the Office of Revenue Sharing can potentially alleviate discriminatory policies and practices in a wide variety of areas.

However, the enforcement of the non-discriminatory provisions of Section 122a of the Revenue Sharing Act depends upon each individual to voice a complaint to the Office of Revenue Sharing in the event he or she feels subjected to discrimination through a program, activity, or employment funded by revenue sharing funds.

The Department of Housing and Urban Development and the 1974 Housing and Community Development Act have also included equal opportunity provisions as requirements for the funding of all housing programs or projects related to housing and community development. The HUD regulations provide for equal opportunity in employment, non-discrimination in the planning for and locating of facilities, and services, and emphasis on the use of minority contractors and minority banking facilities in the disbursement and investment of HUD monies. Similarly, the 1974 Housing and Community Development Act (HCDA) places an emphasis on equal opportunity in the areas of employment, planning and locating facilities and services

⁷ Department of the Treasury, General Revenue Sharing and Civil Rights, 1974, Washington, D.C., p. 1.

as well as provisions for citizen participation.

Furthermore, the 1974 Housing and Community Development Act has addressed the special housing needs of the elderly and the handicapped. The Act requires that at least 20% of HCDA funds be allocated to projects for elderly or handicapped individuals. These special housing projects for the elderly and handicapped must meet "acceptable design standards, provide quality services and management, and contain such related facilities as maybe necessary to accomodate special needs of intended occupants."⁸ In order to insure that elderly and handicapped individuals qualify for lower income housing, the HCDA has defined a family to include occupancy by "2 or more single elderly, disabled or handicapped individuals living together or one or more such individuals living with another person determined essential to their well being."⁹

Handicapped individuals have received increasing attention in recent years through other Federal regulations as well. As of 1968, the Federal government passed Public Law 90-408 requiring all federal buildings to be constructed or modified to allow access to the handicapped. Similarly, on the State level, Connecticut Public Act 216 passed in 1965 required that all public buildings be barrier free so that physically handicapped individuals may enter without difficulty. As can be seen from Table I, these laws affect a fairly large segment of the population in the Waterbury Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area. Furthermore, there may be many more handicapped individuals affected by these regulations within the Central Naugatuck Valley Region since there are many handicapped persons who are living in other regions of the State who may work or travel through the CNVR.

In some ways, the most important regulations prohibiting discrimination are contained in Connecticut's Public Accomodations Law (PAL) and its Fair Employment Practices Law (FEP). These two state statutes recognize more protected classes than any similar federal legislation and are more commonly cited in state cases

⁸ U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, Summary of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974, August 22, 1974, p. 9.

⁹ Ibid. p. 7.

involving housing and employment discrimination. This is clearly seen in Tables IV and V which list all Federal and State laws concerning housing and employment. In addition, the State Contract Compliance Law (Section 4-114a) prohibiting discrimination in state contracts is more pertinent to state cases of employment discrimination than similar Federal legislation since it covers a broader number of employees than any similar federal legislation.

As of 1973, the State's employment discrimination regulations have been expanded to prohibit the termination of a woman's employment because of her pregnancy under Public Act No. 73-647. Furthermore, the state legislature recently passed Public Act 73-573 in 1973 prohibiting discrimination on the basis of sex or marital status in credit transactions.

In large part, the importance of these state statutes is that they provide protection against forms of discrimination not covered by federal regulations and because they provide protection for larger numbers of individuals within the Region and the state than any similar Federal regulations.

3. The A-95 Review Process

Another means of ensuring equal opportunity has been through the A-95 review process. Briefly, the A-95 review allows the Central Naugatuck Valley Regional Planning Agency and designated organizations within the Region to evaluate upcoming federally funded projects to determine their consistency with local and regional plans or programs.

The A-95 review process gives the reviewing agency 30 days to review and comment on all projects needing federal funds with additional review time provided on problem projects until such time as inconsistencies in the project in relation to local or regional plans have been resolved. A report prepared by the Tri-State Regional Planning Commission indicated,.....

in the review process it is possible that problems may arise where projects conflict with other plans and projects, or may not be in conformance with the comprehensive plans for the Region. In this event or should an applicant substantially modify the proposed project as outlined in the "project notification", then further review is required.....⁸

Recently the Connecticut Commission on Human Rights and Opportunities has viewed the A-95 review process as a viable means of monitoring the "civil rights impact" of all federally funded programs within the State. A report prepared by the Commission on Human Rights and Opportunities has recommended that instructional and informational materials on the A-95 process be developed for the express benefit of all human rights agencies who perform or wish to perform A-95 project reviews.⁹

The concerns that the Commission on Human Rights and Opportunities has had with civil rights has been shared by the Tri-State Regional Planning Commission as well.

However Tri-State has recommended that the A-95 review process be used not only as an instrument to make civil rights impact statements but to make social assessments of all programs within the Tri-State Region. In this sense, Tri-State has broadened the use of the A-95 review process to cover other social issues which may go beyond the general sphere of civil rights organizations. They have developed proposed guidelines for the use of the A-95 review process designed to evaluate the social impact of proposed projects on minorities and low income groups in seven different spheres of the planning process.¹⁰

¹⁰ Tri-State Regional Planning Commission, Federal Aid Project Review System, July 15, 1974, p.1.

¹¹ Civil Rights and Circular A-95, p.13.

¹² Tri-State Regional Planning Commission, Social Assessment of Tri-State Plans a Proposal, Interim Technical Report 4493-2804, January, 1975, pp.7-23.

These cover land use, open space and recreation, water supply and sewerage, housing, aviation, highways, and mass transit. If any project should adversely affect minorities or low income groups, the project will be considered to be in non-conformance with Tri-State's plans, policies and objectives. Tri-State has recommended that all regional planning agencies within the Tri-State Region utilize the A-95 review process to evaluate the social impact of all new projects seeking funding. In order to promote regional concern with social and civil rights issues the Central Naugatuck Valley Regional Planning Agency distributes A-95 grant notifications to Regional civil rights/human rights/equal opportunity organizations. A list of these organizations within the Region is provided in Table II of this report along with a supplementary list of organizations that have more specialized concerns in the area of equal opportunity.

4. Enforcement

In order to ensure that the regulations and orders set forth under Federal and State of Connecticut Executive Orders, the 1972 Revenue Sharing Act, the 1964 Civil Rights Act, the 1968 Civil Rights Act, the 1972 EFOA, the 1963 Equal Pay Act, the 1967 Age in Discrimination in Employment Act, the Connecticut Fair Employment Practice Law and the Connecticut Public Accommodations Law are adhered to specific agencies have been delegated the powers to enforce the regulations. The Equal Opportunity Commission (EEOC) and the Office of Revenue Sharing both monitor the policies of business and government to ensure their adherence to the non-discrimination provisions of the 1972 Revenue Sharing Act and the 1972 EEOA. The EEOC has the authority over all public and private organizations with 15 or more employees while the office of Revenue Sharing has authority over local governments receiving revenue sharing funds regardless of the number of employees on its payroll.

In contrast to the single purpose function of the EEOC and the Office of Revenue Sharing, the U.S. Department of Labor enforces several employment discrimination laws. The U.S. Secretary of Labor is responsible for administering and enforcing the Age Discrimination and Employment Act of 1967 as well as Federal Executive Order 11246 and 11345. The U.S. Secretary of Labor has the authority to cancel

government contracts or force compliance with the non-discriminatory provisions of the Executive Order when discriminatory policies or practices are found to exist.

In addition the wage and hour division of the U.S. Department of Labor has the responsibility of investigating those businesses or firms not complying with the Equal Pay Act of 1963.

On a State level, the Connecticut Commission of Labor is given responsibility for administering and enforcing Executive Order Three. The Commissioner of Labor, like the U.S. Secretary of Labor, can cancel government contracts or force compliance with the State Executive Order if contractors are found to have discriminatory policies or practices.

While the Connecticut Commissioner of Labor only has authority over cases involving employment discrimination in government work or government contracts, the Connecticut Commission on Human Rights and Opportunities has the responsibility to investigate all employment and public accommodations policies and practices within Connecticut which may have a discriminatory effect on the basis of race, sex, marital status, religion, age, color, ancestry, physical handicap or national origin. Once investigated, the Commission is empowered to eliminate any and all discriminatory practices through court action or other forms of conciliation that may be appropriate. While many state or federal agencies are given specific powers to enforce anti-discrimination laws, in practice most cases of discrimination falling within the jurisdiction of state or federal agencies are handled by the State Commission on Human Rights and Opportunities. A local spokesperson for the Waterbury Commission on Human Rights and Opportunities indicated that complaints falling within the jurisdiction of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission or the Housing and Urban Development office are almost always investigated and handled by one of the state offices of the Commission of Human Rights and Opportunities. In fact, the EEOC gives special weight to the findings of the State Commission generally allowing the Commission to undertake nearly all investi-

gations of violations of the FEEOA of 1972. Furthermore, while violations of State Executive Order Number Three fall within the domain of the state Commissioner of Labor, in most cases these complaints are handled by one of the offices of the State Commission on Human Rights and Opportunities.

According to the Waterbury Commission on Human Rights and Opportunities the primary responsibility of the Commission is handling employment discrimination cases. This has been especially true in recent months because of the economic depression in the Waterbury area causing an upswing of cases related to discrimination in termination and layoff of industrial workers. As can be seen from Table III, violation of the Fair Employment Practices Law accounted for approximately 78 percent of all discrimination cases in the Central Naugatuck Valley Region during 1974. The second most common type of complaint handled by the Commission are sex discrimination cases which in 1974 accounted for 23 percent of all the complaints received from municipalities in the CNVR. According to the Director of the Waterbury Commission, sex discrimination cases are expected to increase as a result of the passage of the Equal Pay Act, the State Public Act 73-573 designed to prohibit discrimination on the basis of sex or marital status and Public Act 73-647 designed to prohibit discrimination because of maternity leave.

For certain forms of discrimination such as exclusionary zoning, where no federal or state agency has been delegated the power of enforcing equal opportunity, the courts have been the only recourse available to those who feel their rights have been denied. In recent years the courts have been increasingly disapproving of zoning regulations which effectively exclude low income and minority groups through stipulating (1) excessive house size or lot size requirements, (2) by prohibiting multi-family housing (3) creating bedroom restrictions which exclude families with children or (4) by overzoning for non-residential uses within the community.

In the Mount Laurel, New Jersey case the Supreme Court of New Jersey recently decided that although exclusionary zoning in an urbanizing community had been maintained to keep down local property taxes this "policy was carried out without

regard for nonfiscal considerations of people either within or without of its boundaries." The key finding of the Court was as follows:

"As a developing municipality, Mount Laurel must, by its land use regulations, make realistically possible the opportunity for an appropriate variety and choice of housing for all categories of people who may desire to live there, of course including those of low and moderate income. It must permit multi-family housing, without bedroom or similar restrictions, as well as small dwellings on very small lots, low cost housing of other types and, in general, high density zoning, without artificial and unjustifiable minimum requirements as to lot size, building size and the like, to meet the full panoply of these needs. Certainly when a municipality zones for industry and commerce for local tax benefit purposes, it without question must zone to permit adequate housing within the means of the employees involved in such uses."

In effect the Court decided that the municipality must zone primarily for the living welfare of people and not for the benefit of the local tax rate. The New Jersey Court decision serves ample warning to other states that zoning regulations of communities standing in the path of future urban growth which disadvantage certain classes of individuals within a Region by limiting their housing opportunities may be successfully challenged in the years ahead.

a. based on 100 percent sample
b. based on 15 percent sample
c. based on 30 percent sample
d. based on 5 percent sample

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, Census of Population and Housing: 1970 Census Tracts, Final Report PC (1)-222 Waterbury, Connecticut, SMSA, and General Social and Economic Characteristics, Connecticut PC (1)-C3.

*Includes all municipalities in the Region with the exception of Oxford, Bethelham, and Southbury.

**Census information on disabled or handicapped includes all individuals who had a physical disability at the time of the census which limited their kind or amount of work which they could do and those whose health prevented them from doing work at all.

13. Supreme Court of New Jersey, Southern Burlington County NAACP et als. v. Township of Mount Laurel, Decided March 24, 1975.

Table I

	Waterbury	SMSA*
Total Population ^a (1970)	108,033	208,956
Blacks ^a	10,891	11,554
Spanish Speaking ^b	3,987	5,026
Women ^a	56,900	108,088
Number of Disabled ^{**d} or Handicapped (1970)	4,964	9,666
Number in Labor Force ^d	2,557	5,540
Number not in Labor Force ^d	2,407	4,126
Number of Civilians in Labor Force (16 years and older) ^c 1970	46,920	89,380
Blacks ^c	4,077	4,283
Spanish Speaking ^c	1,411	1,663
Women ^c	19,585	35,685
Percent of Civilian Labor Force (16 years and older) ^c 1970	100.0	100.0
Blacks ^c	8.7	4.8
Spanish Speaking ^b	3.0	1.9
Women ^c	41.7	39.9

- a. based on 100 percent sample
- b. based on 15 percent sample
- c. based on 20 percent sample
- d. based on 5 percent sample

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, Census of Population and Housing: 1970 Census Tracts, Final Report PHC (1)-227 Waterbury, Connecticut, SMSA, and General Social and Economic Characteristics, Connecticut PC (1)-C8.

*Includes all municipalities in the Region with the exception of Oxford, Bethlehem, and Southbury.

**Census information on disabled or handicapped includes all individuals who had a physical disability at the time of the census which limited their kind or amount of work which they could do and ~~those~~ whose health prevented them from doing work at all.

Table II

Civil Rights/Human Rights/Equal Opportunity Agencies within the
State and the Central Naugatuck Valley Region

- | | |
|--|--|
| 1. NOW, Inc.
232 North Elm Street
Waterbury, Connecticut | 7. Easter Seals Rehabilitation Center
of Greater Waterbury, Inc.
22 Thompkins Street
Waterbury, Connecticut |
| 2. Model Cities
Chase Municipal Building
236 Grand Street
Waterbury, Connecticut | 8. Area Agency on Aging
20 East Main Street
Waterbury, Connecticut |
| 3. Human Rights and Opportunity
Commission
79 Linden Street
Waterbury, Connecticut | 9. Waterbury Area Women's Center
25 Grand Street
Waterbury, Connecticut |
| <u>Supplementary List</u> | |
| 4. Permanent Commission on the
Status of Women
6 Grand Street
Hartford, Connecticut | 10. Legal Aid and Reference Service
South End Office
8 Union Street
Waterbury, Connecticut |
| 5. Health and Mental Health Planning
Council
20 East Main Street
Waterbury, Connecticut | 11. Education Instruccion
1229 Albany Avenue
Hartford, Connecticut |
| 6. United Cerebral Palsy of Greater
Waterbury Area, Inc.
61 Bidwell Street
Waterbury, Connecticut | 12. NAACP
5 Caroline Street
Waterbury, Connecticut |

Table III

Complaints Received by the Waterbury Commission on Human Rights and Opportunity from the Municipalities in the Central Naugatuck Valley Region*: 1974

Violation	Protected Classes	Number of Complaints
Fair Employment Practices	race, creed, color	46
Fair Employment Practices	age	9
Fair Employment Practices	sex	19
Fair Employment Practices	physical disability	7
Public Accommodations	race, creed, color	5
Public Accommodations	sex	3
Public Accommodations	marital status	0
Public Accommodations (Housing)	race, creed, color	11
Public Accommodations (Housing)	sex	1
Credit Transactions	sex	1
Credit Transactions	marital status	2
Total		104

*There were no complaints reported from the municipalities of Woodbury, Middlebury and Oxford during calendar year 1974. However, the remaining ten municipalities of the Region did report one or more cases of discrimination under either the Fair Employment Practices Act or the Public Accommodations Act.

SOURCE: The Waterbury Commission on Human Rights and Opportunities, May, 1975.

Table IV

State and Federal Regulations Covering Employment, Housing, Public
Accommodations and Provision of Services, within the Region: May, 1975

Employment Laws	Protected Classes									Area of Coverage
	RACE	SEX	COLOR	RELIGION	AGE	ANCESTRY	NATIONAL ORIGIN	PHYSICAL DISABILITY	PREGNANCY	
Federal Executive Order 11246	X		X	X			X			Federal Government Employment Contractors and Subcontractors
Federal Executive Order 11375		X								Federal Government Employment Contractors and Subcontractors
State Executive Order No. 3	X	X	X	X	X	X	X			State Contractors and Subcontractors
Equal Employment Opportunity Act	X	X	X	X			X			All People in Nation
Fair Employment Practices Law	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		All State Residents
Equal Pay Act		X								Most Public and Private Employees
An Act Concerning Maternity Leave (Public Act No. 73-647)									X	Pregnant Women
Nondiscrimination Clauses in State Contracts (Section 4-114a)	X		X	X			X			State Contracts
Age Discrimination in Employment Act					X					Individuals 40-65 years of age

Table V

State and Federal Regulations Covering Employment, Housing, Public
Accommodations and Provisions of Services, within the Region: May, 1975

Housing and Provision of Services Laws	Protected Classes									Area of Coverage
	RACE	SEX	COLOR	RELIGION	AGE	ANCESTRY	NATIONAL ORIGIN	PHYSICAL DISABILITY	PREGNANCY	
Civil Rights Act of 1968 Title VIII	X	X	X				X	X		Dwellings owned or operated or provided with loans or loans in- sured by federal government or housing obtained by federal finan- cial assistance for Urban Renewal
Civil Rights Act of 1964 Title VI	X		X	X	X	X	X			Any program or activity receiving federal financial assistance
Executive Order 11063	X		X	X			X			Sale or rental of residential pro- perty or related facilities owned or operated or provided with finan- cial assistance by the Federal Government
General Revenue Sharing Act (Title I Public Law 92-512)	X	X	X				X			Any program or activity funded by Revenue Sharing funds
Public Accommodations Law (Section 53-35)	X	X	X	X		X	X	X		All places of public accommodations, resort or amusement and all housing for sale or rental
Federal Public Law 90-408								X		Access to federal buildings
State Public Act 216								X		Access to all public buildings

XIV. OBJECTIVES AND POLICIES - Equal Opportunity

OBJECTIVE I: To ensure that all individuals receive full and equal opportunity for (1) education (2) employment and advancement (3) access to public accommodations (4) housing (5) provision of public services (police, fire, sanitation, etc.) (6) representation in local government (7) participation in local and Regional planning and (8) use of public transportation within the Region regardless of their race, color, creed, religion, sex, age, national origin, physical disability, or socio-economic status.

POLICY 1.1: To ensure that all employers within the Region are aware of the State and Federal regulations governing employment discrimination.

POLICY 1.2: To encourage the Commission on Human Rights and Opportunities to develop educational programs to inform residents of the Region of their housing and employment rights.

POLICY 1.3: To encourage all employers in the Region to announce employment openings through the Connecticut Employment Office in Waterbury.

POLICY 1.4: To encourage residents of the Region to participate in local and Regional planning processes.

POLICY 1.5: To ensure that all municipalities and neighborhoods within municipalities receive sufficient public protection from fire, the threat of crime, unsanitary conditions and other natural disasters.

POLICY 1.6: To ensure that all federal revenue sharing funds disbursed within the Region shall be used in a non-discriminatory manner to benefit all residents of the Region regardless of race, color, national origin or sex. (Section 122a of the Revenue Sharing Act.)

1.6.1: Ensure equal provision of services under each revenue sharing program or activity.

1.6.2: Ensure that disbursement of funds for sub-contracting by revenue sharing recipients is in accordance with non-discriminatory provisions of Section 122a of the Revenue Sharing Act of 1972.

1.6.3: Ensure that the location of facilities constructed by revenue sharing funds does not discriminate on the basis of race, sex, color, or national origin.

1.6.4: To ensure that eligibility or membership in programs funded by revenue sharing is in accordance with the non-discriminatory policies of Section 122a of the Revenue Sharing Act of 1972.

POLICY 1.7: To ensure that all civil rights/human rights/equal opportunities organizations within the Region review and comment on all A-95 review grant notifications having an impact within the Region.

POLICY 1.8: To encourage all the municipalities to comply with the Regional Planning Agency's Fair Share allocation plan and to encourage the maintenance and/or adoption of land use regulations which provide opportunities for low income individuals and families to move to the municipality of their choice.

1.8.1: To encourage the greater provision of low income housing within the Region.

1.8.2; Each municipality should evaluate its zoning regulations to ensure that it is not unintentionally having an exclusionary effect on low income families and individuals.

POLICY 1.9: To encourage all municipalities to take a regional approach to

public transportation for the elderly, youth, handicapped and low income residents of the Region.

1.9.1: Encourage coordination and fiscal cooperation in the provision of intermunicipal bus and mini-bus services as provided by buses funded under grants from the Areawide Agency on Aging, Northeast Bus Company and private mini-bus services.

POLICY 1.10: To encourage the use of a broader fiscal base than the property tax for the provision of public education within the State and the Region.

1.10.1: To encourage the use of Regional school districts supported by revenue sharing or other federal or State funds.

POLICY 1.11: To encourage the provision of entrance ramps for disabled or handicapped individuals in all public buildings and in all State or federally funded buildings serving the elderly and the handicapped.

OBJECTIVE II: To find alternativesways of providing housing opportunities for minority groups through public or private organizations. Programs like CHIF are encouraged within the Region.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. American Institute of Planners, The National Planning Policy of the American Institute of Planners, Washington, D.C., March, 1974.
2. Connecticut Commission on Human Rights and Opportunities, Administrative Implementation of Civil Rights in Connecticut, Hartford, Conn., May, 1973.
3. _____, 1974 Annual Report, Hartford, Connecticut.
4. _____, Rights, Opportunities, Action Reporter, Fall, 1973.
5. _____, Directory of Resources Organizations and Media Serving Minority Communities in Connecticut, Hartford, Connecticut, 1973.
6. _____, Public Hearings of the Connecticut Commission on Human Rights and Opportunities, An Interim Report, Hartford, Connecticut, 1969.
7. Connecticut General Statutes, Connecticut Public Accommodations Law, Section 53-34 to 53-36d, Revised 1972 as amended.
8. _____, Connecticut Fair Employment Practices Law 31-122 to 31-128, Revised 1972 as amended.
9. _____, An Act Concerning Maternity Leave, Public Act Number 73-647, Revised 1972 as amended.
10. _____, Nondiscrimination Clauses in State Contracts, Section 4-114a, Revised 1972 as amended.
11. Department of Housing and Urban Development, Community Planning and Management and Equal Opportunity, Field Office Guidelines for Equal Opportunity in the Comprehensive Planning Assistance Program (701), January, 1973.
12. Department of the Treasury, General Revenue Sharing and Civil Rights, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1974.
13. Foster, Howard Jr., and Douglas Johnson, Citizen Advisory Group Training, The University of Rhode Island, December 1973.
14. Governor Thomas Meskill, State of Connecticut, Executive Order Number Three, June, 1971.
15. _____, Executive Order Number Seventeen, February, 1973.
16. Highway Research Board, Citizen Participation in Transportation Planning, National Academy of Sciences - National Academy of Engineering, Washington, D.C., 1973.
17. Joint Center for Political Studies, Metropolitan Government: A Black Analytical Perspective, Washington, D.C., 1972.
18. _____, Regionalism and Minority Participation, Washington, D.C., August, 1973.
19. _____, The Minority Community and Revenue Sharing, Washington, D.C., June, 1973.

20. Mayor's Community Development Advisory Committee, Facts About the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974, Waterbury, Connecticut, December, 1974.
21. Ninetieth Congress, Age Discrimination in Employment Act of 1967 (Public Law 90-202), U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1968.
22. The Office of Exploratory Research and Problem Assessment Research Applied to National Needs, National Science Foundation, Citizen Participation in State Government: A Summary Report, Washington, D.C., December 1973.
23. The Potomac Institutes, Housing Guide to Equal Opportunity, Washington, D.C., June, 1968.
24. President Lyndon B. Johnson, Executive Order 11246 Equal Employment Opportunity, September, 1965.
25. Subcommittee on Labor of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, United States Senate, The Equal Employment Opportunity Act of 1972, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1972.
26. Tri-State Regional Planning Commission, Federal Aid Project Review System, July 15, 1974.
27. _____, Environmental Assessment of Tri-State Plans: A Proposed Program, January, 1975.
28. _____, Social Assessment of Tri-State Plans: A Proposal, January, 1975.
29. _____, Planning With The Citizens, January, 1974.
30. _____, Social Assessment of Tri-State Plans: A Proposal, Interim Technical Report 4493-2804, January, 1975.
31. U.S. Bureau of the Census, Census of Population and Housing, 1970 Census Tracts, Final Report PHC(1) - 227 Waterbury, Connecticut SMSA, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., March, 1972.
32. _____, General Social and Economic Characteristics, Connecticut PC(1)-C8, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., April, 1972.
33. U.S. Civil Service Commission, Bureau of Intergovernmental Personnel Programs, Equal Employment Opportunity Court Cases, Washington, D.C., U.S. Government Printing Office, March, 1974.
34. U.S. Department of Commerce, Office of Minority Business Enterprise, National Roster of Minority Consulting Professional Firms, Washington, D.C., February, 1973.
35. U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, Affirmative Action and Equal Opportunity, Volumes I and II, Washington, D.C., January, 1974.
36. U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, HEW and Civil Rights, Washington, D.C., U.S. Government Printing Office, 1973.
37. U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, Office of Equal Opportunity, Fair Housing Law and Other Federal Civil Rights Laws and Executive Orders Relating to the Programs of the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, Equal Opportunity, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1969.

38. United States Department of Labor, Employment Standards Administration, Wage and Hour Division, How The Fair Labor Standards Act Applies To Domestic Service Workers, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1974.
39. _____, Age Discrimination in Employment Act of 1967, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1973.
40. _____, Equal Pay For Equal Work, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1973.
41. _____, Handy Reference Guide to the Fair Labor Standards Act, Effective May 1, 1974, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1974.
42. _____, Equal Pay Under the Fair Labor Standards Act, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1974.
43. Vaitkus, Jurate, Connecticut Commission on Human Rights, Civil Rights and Circular A-95, unpublished and undated report.

